
Graduate Education in Political Psychology

Author(s): David O. Sears and Carolyn L. Funk

Source: *Political Psychology*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Jun., 1991), pp. 345-362

Published by: International Society of Political Psychology

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3791469>

Accessed: 14-03-2017 06:13 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/3791469?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



International Society of Political Psychology is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Political Psychology*

Issues in Professional Development

Graduate Education in Political Psychology¹

David O. Sears² and Carolyn L. Funk²

Data are presented from a survey of graduate courses and graduate training programs in political psychology in the United States and Canada. Courses labeled "political psychology" are of relatively recent vintage and are offered most often in political science departments. They generally do not cover the entire field, but focus on one of three major areas: mass political behavior, personality and politics, or the psychology of international relations. Most major political science departments now offer courses in political psychology, though a critical mass of faculty exists in only about 14 universities. Seven formalized doctoral training programs exist with multiple courses and faculty, most quite recent in origin and most are distinctly interdisciplinary. Doctoral studies in political science or psychology can specialize in political psychology, but no free-standing interdisciplinary degree programs currently exist.

KEY WORDS: graduate training programs; graduate courses; political psychology.

INTRODUCTION

Political psychology began to take on the trappings of an identifiable and autonomous academic field in the 1970s. Courses in political psychology were taught at some universities, a *Handbook* (Knutson, 1973), and some textbooks appeared, and then, in 1978, ISPP and the journal *Political Psychology* came into being. Since then the field has continued to flourish and even to expand in all these respects. At this point political psychology would seem to be a viable and stable element of the academic universe.

Yet for the long-run health of an academic field, today's active teachers and researchers must continually be replaced by the next generation. In our system,

¹Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Washington, D.C., July 11–14, 1990.

²Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024.

this usually means that graduate students must be trained in some self-conscious manner to be specialists in the field. In the traditional disciplines, this is normally a routinized and bureaucratized process, with long-standing programs, courses, financial support for students, and so forth.

There are special dangers for political psychology in this process. It is basically an interdisciplinary endeavor, and as such always runs the danger of falling between the cracks in academic institutions. Interdisciplinary fields often have particular trouble replenishing themselves, because, among other things, pressures for disciplinary orthodoxy are induced by bureaucratic inertia and the job market. A key factor in the long-term success of political psychology, then, will be whether or not doctoral students take courses in political psychology and are being trained for careers in the field (Sears, 1989).

The main purpose of this paper is to address one piece of this puzzle: Has political psychology penetrated as a distinctive topic into the doctoral training programs in American universities? We will address a series of questions in doing so:

- Has political psychology become a course that is frequently taught at the graduate level? If so, under what title? Is it usually taught by a single interested professor, or does a critical mass of faculty exist at a significant number of major universities?
- Political psychology potentially covers a long waterfront of possible topics. What substantive topics are taught at the graduate level? Is there a consensus on what topics the field consists of? Are courses taught that cover the full spectrum?
- What graduate training programs exist in the United States in political psychology? Are they firmly institutionalized such that students can easily specialize in political psychology, or must they petition for individualized programs?
- Has political psychology penetrated in equivalent ways in political science and in psychology departments? Does it have a visible presence elsewhere, such as in history or sociology or in professional schools?

METHOD

A mail survey was distributed to faculty with interests in political psychology, as described elsewhere (Funk and Sears, 1991). Representatives from 138 institutions in the United States and Canada responded. Of these, roughly 100 had both undergraduate and graduate students at their institutions. Respondents were asked to list each course "using a psychological approach to political phenomena," and for each one, the title, sponsoring department, first year the course was taught, how often the course is taught, the average enrollment, and whether it was for graduate or undergraduate students. The content of the course

was indicated by the title and by a checklist of 15 topics which might be included in the course. The form also asked, "Is it possible for graduate students to specialize in political psychology?" and if so, whether at the Ph.D. or M.A. level, in which department, whether as a formal specialty or individualized program, and whether as a major or minor area.

GRADUATE COURSES

In all, 100 graduate courses turned up in the course of this survey, including 16 open to both graduates and undergraduates. We coded them into four broad categories.

Explicitly Labeled as Political Psychology

Twenty-one institutions had graduate courses that were explicitly labeled as focusing on political psychology, since each had the terms "political" (or "politics") and "psychology" in its title. Table I lists these courses. Five universities listed more than one such course (three each at UCLA and Ohio State, and two each at UC Irvine, UC Berkeley, and University of South Carolina). What can we say about these 28 graduate courses?

1. Almost all (24 of 28) are listed in political science departments. Four are also cross-listed with psychology, one with psychology and history, while only four are listed solely in psychology. Political psychology would seem to have established more of a place in political science than in psychology doctoral programs.

2. The courses are typically given in alternate years. Only six were given every year, and four less than every other year. Presumably, then, the offering has a somewhat lower priority than the traditional disciplinary core courses.

3. "Political psychology" as a specific course with that title is quite a new invention in American doctoral programs and a rapidly growing one. This is shown in the first column of Table II. Two courses began as early as 1970 (Rutgers, UCLA), and four others antedated the beginnings of ISPP (1972, Kansas; 1975, Minnesota, North Carolina, South Carolina). But 59% of the courses we have data on began in the last 6 years.

4. In the aggregate, there seems to be a reasonably clear consensus about what substantive topics fall under the heading of political psychology, as shown in Table III. Our data on this point come from the checklist of 15 possible topics in political psychology which are listed in Table III. Almost everyone teaches political cognition, and most deal with public opinion, voting, mass media, political socialization, psychobiography, personality types, leadership, and eth-

Table I. Graduate Courses in Political Psychology^a**Explicitly Labeled as "Political Psychology"**

Political Psychology (Duke, Harvard, Houston, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, North Carolina, Northwestern, Ohio State, Rutgers, South Carolina, SUNY-Stony Brook, UC Berkeley, UC Irvine (2),^b UCLA^c (3), Wisconsin-Madison, Yale^c)

Political Psychology

. . . and Socialization (Minnesota)

. . . and the Study of Beliefs (South Carolina)

Psychology of Mass Politics (Ohio State)

Psychology of Political Behavior (GWU^b; Ohio State^b; UC Berkeley^c)

More specialized but explicitly political and psychological:

Politics and Personality (Princeton, Ohio State, Tulane)

Power and Personality (BC)

Ideology and Personality (UCSB)

Human Nature and Politics (Loyola)

Psychoanalytic Approaches to Political and Social Issues (Toronto)

Personality and the Policy Process (Kent State)

Psychodynamics of Political Behavior (CUNY Graduate Center)

Political Psychology: the Contemporary American Self (CUNY Graduate Center)

Political Cognition (SUNY - SB, Minnesota^c)

Seminar in Political Affect and Cognition (Wisconsin - Madison)

Political Learning and Culture (Wisconsin - Milwaukee)

Cognitive Psychology and International Relations (Pittsburgh^b)

Political Learning (Washington U.)

Cognitive Factors in War and Peace (CUNY Graduate Center)

Behavioral Decision Theory (SUNY-Stony Brook)

Political Socialization (Rutgers, SUNY-SB, North Carolina)**Psychology of International Relations (Ohio State^c)**

Psychology of Conflict Resolution and Justice (Teachers College^c)

Foreign Policy Decision-making (Northern Illinois)

Individual and Foreign Policy Decisions (Arizona State)

International Behavior (Oregon State)

Psychology of Conflict and Aggression (Yale^c)

Human and Social Dimensions of Genocide (Teachers College^c)

^aAll courses are taught in political science unless otherwise noted.

^bJointly listed in political science and psychology.

^cTaught in psychology only.

nicity or race. Less common is an emphasis on gender or on various facets of international relations.

5. But relatively few of these courses, to this point, seem to be truly omnibus courses covering the entire field of political psychology. We found only seven (out of the full list of 28) that qualified as such. Rather, there are several "political psychologies" that represent distinct and independent academic topics, and most of these courses comprise only a subset of them.

This can be seen using three different criteria for comprehensiveness. At the crudest level, the field can be divided into three main content areas: mass political behavior (including public opinion, voting, and mass media communications), personality and politics (including psychobiography, personality types,

Table II. Graduate Courses: Year First Taught, by Content Area

	Course Title				
	Explicitly Labeled Political Psychology	Personality and Politics	Other Political Psychology	Total Political Psychology	Mass Political Behavior
1986–90	59%	22%	50%	50%	25%
1981–85	11	22	8	12	20
1976–80	7	11	0	6	5
1970–75	22	44	25	27	20
1960s	0	0	8	2	15
Don't know	0	0	8	2	15
Total	99%	99%	99%	99%	100%
No response	1	1	8	10	7
N	28	10	18	56	27

and leadership), and international relations (including conflict management, political violence and terrorism, and peace research/nuclear war). At a somewhat more demanding level, we can ask how many touched on at least five of the six main categories, consisting of those three *plus* political cognition, political socialization, and groups in politics (ethnic, race, and/or gender). And at another level, how many touched on at least half of the full list of 15 topics?

Six courses meet all three criteria: those taught by John Sullivan (Minnesota), Margaret Hermann (Ohio State University), Arthur Miller (Iowa), Robert Abelson (Yale), and Jack Citrin and Laura Stoker (UC Berkeley), and the introductory proseminars in political psychology taught by Donald Kinder (Michigan) and by Sears and his colleagues (UCLA). Two of the three criteria are met as well by the courses taught by Philip Tetlock, at UC Berkeley; by Lewis Lipsitz, at North Carolina; by Kathleen Knight, at Houston; and by Jerrold Post, at George Washington University.

More commonly, courses taught only one or two of the three main subsets of the field. The most common emphasis was to deal almost exclusively with mass political behavior: Harvard (Tate), Ohio State (Krosnick, Rahn), Illinois (Kuklinski), Indiana (Carmines), and UCLA (an advanced seminar taught by Sears or Iyengar). Others dealt with both mass politics and personality: Duke (Barber), UC Irvine (Rosenberg *et al.*), Wisconsin (Sapiro), Kansas (Cigler), Rutgers (various), and South Carolina (Kreml). Although these courses varied considerably in their attention to the traditional mass political behavior topics of voting, public opinion, and the media, they gave none at all to the various problems surrounding international relations. A quite separate cluster of explicitly labeled political psychology courses combined an interest in personality and leadership with international relations: North Carolina (Lipsitz); GWU (J.

Table III. Content of Graduate Courses in Political Psychology^a

	Course Title				
	Explicitly Labeled Political Psychology	Personality and Politics	Int'l Relations	Other Political Psychology	Total Political Psychology
Political Cognition	92%	75%	50%	71%	81%
Mass Political Behavior					
Public opinion	69	0	33	14	45
Voting	62	0	0	0	34
Mass media communications	69	12	33	29	49
Ethnicity/racial group relations	50	12	50	43	43
Gender and politics	31	12	17	43	28
Political Socialization	62	62	50	86	68
Personality and Politics					
Political personality types	69	88	50	57	68
Leadership	65	75	67	29	62
Psychobiography	62	75	0	57	55
International Relations					
International relations	35	50	100	29	45
Conflict management	27	50	83	0	34
Political violence and terrorism	35	25	50	14	32
Peace research/nuclear war	8	12	67	14	17
Miscellaneous					
Biopolitics	4	25	17	14	11
N	21	7	6	7	39

^aNonresponses excluded from the base.

Post); UC Berkeley (Tetlock); U. South Carolina (Rosati). These courses generally did not treat mass political behavior.

In short, courses in “political psychology” at the graduate level only rarely, at this point, touch on the full range of topics in the field. Rather, there are several “political psychologies.” The largest divide is between those which take a socio-psychological approach to mass political behavior (sometimes with attention to personality) and those which take up questions of leadership and international relations, war and peace, and the like, which also focus on personality. Presumably the two clusters also tend to differ in that the former tends to emphasize mass behavior, and the latter, elite behavior.

More Specialized but Explicitly Both Political and Psychological

This portrait of the several “political psychologies” persists if we broaden our scope to consider a second category, consisting of courses explicitly dealing with politics from a psychological viewpoint, but not labeled “political psychology.” We included courses in this category if their titles did not use the term “political psychology” but did include *both* a political term (such as power, politics, international relations, etc.) *and* an explicitly psychological term (such as cognition, affect, psychodynamic, personality, socialization, learning, etc.). These typically had titles reflecting specialization on a subtopic of political psychology.

Twenty-eight such courses are offered (by 23 institutions). They too are primarily offered in political science departments (82% are). Ten focus on politics and personality, eight on political cognition and learning, three on political socialization, and seven on the psychology of international relations. These are listed at the bottom of Table I.

Interestingly enough, these more specialized courses tend to be offered more often than the explicitly labeled political psychology courses. Half are offered annually, and 88% at least in alternate years. Perhaps this is partly because they have been around longer. More date from the pre-ISPP era, especially those on personality and politics and political socialization, which together had a median starting date of 1975. The psychology-of-international-relations courses had a wide variety of starting dates, ranging from Morton Deutsch’s course on conflict resolution (1965, at Teachers’ College) to the Christie-Milburn course at Ohio State (1990).

The titles of these courses would suggest that they are more specialized, and more likely to address just one aspect of the field, than are the explicitly labeled political psychology courses. This is in fact the case, as shown in Table III. Almost all of the politics and personality courses cover psychobiography, personality types, and leadership, and about half cover political socialization. But they

scarcely touch on sociopsychological work on mass politics and behavior: None covers public opinion or voting, and only one each covers media, gender, or ethnicity. Similarly, almost all the courses dealing with international relations also cover conflict management, and most cover peace research, political violence, and terrorism. Most also cover leadership, and half cover personality types. But they too give little attention to mass political behavior. Interestingly enough, this is the one (although small) category in which psychology departments dominate: two thirds of the courses in the psychology of international relations are listed there.

Finally, there are eight other courses on political cognition and learning, and three on political socialization. Unfortunately, we were provided content for only seven of these courses, so it is not clear how meaningful our data are. However these courses, too, tended to be quite specialized. They tended to focus on political socialization, ethnicity and gender, and personality; they did not deal with such mass-behavior topics as public opinion or voting, or with problems of international conflict.

Political Behavior, Public Opinion, and Mass Media

We also received information that political psychology was covered in courses that did not have titles explicitly mentioning both a political and a psychological term. The major category again concerned mass political behavior; eight institutions had courses labeled as “political behavior”; four, courses on public opinion; two, on attitudes and opinions in general; five, on voting behavior; and seven, on mass communications. We suspect this is a considerable underestimate of the number of such courses. We had asked people whether they taught courses in political psychology, but we did not ask them to go on to describe any course containing some political-psychological themes. So we suspect that these returns are just the tip of the iceberg; we assume that voting behavior and/or public opinion are taught at most universities, and political psychology is central to that field.

In any case, for this sample, political science was again the dominant department, hosting 22 of the 26 courses. These courses tend to be of considerably older vintage than the “political psychology” courses (whether explicitly labeled as such or not), as shown in Table II. Most of these mass-political-behavior courses either began in the early 1970s or before, or go back into “prehistory” for the respondent. Only 25% began in the last five years, compared to 50% of the political psychology courses.

The content of these courses, not surprisingly, is almost exclusively limited to the “traditional” topics of mass political behavior: public opinion, voting, mass media, and political socialization. This is shown in Table III. We deem

these topics “traditional” because the term reflects the origins of that subfield in the 1950s and 1960s, influenced as it was by the pioneering sociopsychological work on these four topics developed by researchers at Columbia, Chicago, and Michigan, and summarized in the standard handbook chapters on political behavior (Kinder and Sears, 1985; Lipset *et al.*, 1954; Sears, 1969).

Political Psychology as a Whole

All told, then, these institutions offer 28 courses explicitly labeled as political psychology, and another 28 courses with titles containing both political and psychological terms but not labeled as “political psychology.” What can we say in toto about these 56 courses, which seem to be the core of the graduate offerings in political psychology?³

Again, the first observation to make is that political psychology is a very recent addition to our doctoral listings. Only one course dates back to the 1960s, and six others began in 1970, but by 1980, only 35% of them were in place. Exactly half began since 1986. Second, courses are more often offered in political science than in psychology departments. Of the 56 courses listed above, 73% were listed solely in political science, 12% solely in psychology, and 14% were offered jointly across the two. At the graduate level, then, political psychology is largely housed in political science departments.

What topics do the courses cover? Again, in the aggregate, they cover the entire field. Table III shows that almost every topic is covered by at least a quarter of these courses. But perhaps more obvious is that there is as yet relatively little consensus on what the field comprises. Only one topic (“political cognition”) is covered by more than 70% of the courses. Few omnibus courses are taught, and these tend to be rather recently devised. Rather, whether or not political psychology courses are given specialized labels, the courses tend to be rather specialized. Note that in this respect graduate courses depart from undergraduate courses in political psychology, which are much more likely to cover the full spectrum of the field (Funk and Sears, 1991).

Our suspicion is that these political psychology courses have three general antecedents. One arises from courses on mass political behavior that date to the founding days of the “behavioralist” movement in political science. These

³We should note, however, that we have used a very high threshold by including as courses in “political psychology” only those whose titles refer explicitly to those two terms. All courses in our survey were remitted to us as covering political psychology, but we have excluded courses in “political behavior” or in other kindred topics, which may in fact be very similar. Furthermore, we have omitted from our analysis a series of courses that were mentioned but whose titles did not seem intrinsically political-psychological: political leadership, public policy, intergroup attitudes, social psychology, group processes, managerial psychology, law and society, and international relations.

courses, once described with such titles as Public Opinion, Propaganda, Voting Behavior, Mass Politics, or Political Behavior, now may be being gradually converted to titles with more psychological labels. A second antecedent is composed of quite idiosyncratic courses dealing with idiosyncratically chosen topics, often dating to the early 1970s, originated by faculty with a particular interest in personality, political socialization, international conflict, or whatever. Many faculty at research universities are allowed to offer an idiosyncratic graduate seminar at least every other year, and this may have been it. And the third is a rapidly increasing use of the term "political psychology" to describe a self-conscious academic specialty. This began rather slowly in the 1970s, propelled most visibly by the Knutson (1973) *Handbook* and the organization of ISPP and *Political Psychology* in 1978. The use of this term has accelerated rapidly in the last few years.

Penetration in Political Science

Another way to assess the prevalence of graduate courses in political psychology is to ask what proportion of the highest-prestige doctoral programs offer them. To examine this, we looked at the departments ranked most highly in faculty quality in the 1981 Conference Board evaluations (Jones *et al.*, 1982), in citations in the *Social Sciences Citation Index* (Klingemann, 1986), and in citations of work by former doctoral students (Klingemann *et al.*, 1989). We classified those as most highly reputed if they were ranked highly (in the top 25, 25, and 20, respectively) in at least two of these three surveys. The courses and faculty involved in these universities are presented in Table IV.

Of the resulting 24 institutions, two thirds had courses in political psychology, at least in the broad terms described in Table I. Two others had closely linked courses which were regarded by our informants as having a strong political-psychological component (Jervis, Columbia; Stephenson, Hawaii). We have no evidence of any political psychology courses at just six of these universities: No one at MIT, Cornell, or Johns Hopkins responded to the survey, and informants at Chicago, Stanford, and Rochester reported only voting behavior or public opinion courses. One must conclude that political psychology is at least a visible, if often small, presence in almost every university with a "top-24" political science department.

DOCTORAL TRAINING

We have identified seven distinct doctoral-level training programs in political psychology. They are listed in chronological order below (also see Table IV).

Table IV. Penetration of Political Psychology in Universities with Highest-Prestige Political Science Departments^a

University	Most Central Course	Program	Key Faculty
California, Berkeley	Political psychology (2) ^b	—	H. Brady, J. Citrin, L. Stoker, P. Tetlock, T. Tyler
California, Los Angeles	Political psychology (3) ^c	Program ^c —minor	L. Bobo, D. Larson, S. Iyengar, P. Loewenberg, D. Sears, J. Sidanius, J. Zaller
Chicago	(Media and voting behavior)	—	—
CUNY, Graduate Center	Psychodynamics of political behavior	Program ^c —major	A. Arian, E. Hollander, R. Lifton, S. Renshon (R. Jervis)
Columbia	(International relations)	—	—
Cornell	—	—	—
Duke	Political psychology	Individualized	J. D. Barber
Harvard	Politics and psychology	—	K. Tate
Hawaii	(Political behavior)	Specialty	I. Rohter, G. Schubert, C. Stephenson
Illinois	Political psychology	Individualized	J. Kuklinski
Indiana	Political psychology	Individualized	E. Carnines, B. Hershey
Iowa	Political psychology	—	A. Miller
Johns Hopkins	—	—	—
MIT	—	—	—
Michigan	Proseminar in political psychology	Specialty—major	D. Kinder, D. Winter
Minnesota	Political psychology and socialization	Individualized	E. Borgida, J. Sullivan
North Carolina	Political psychology	Individualized	L. Lipsitz, A. Stern
Northwestern	Political psychology ^d	Specialty—major ^d	—
Ohio State	Political psychology (5)	Program—minor ^c	D. Christie, M. Hermann, R. Hermann, J. Krosnick, T. Milburn, W. Rahn
Princeton	Politics and personality	Individualized	F. Greenstein
Rochester	(Voting behavior)	—	(R. Niemi)
Stanford	(Voting behavior)	—	(R. Brody, A. George, P. Sniderman)
Wisconsin	Political psychology	Program—major	J. Dennis, R. Merelman, V. Sapiro
Yale	Political psychology	Specialty—major	R. Abelson, A. Azzi, D. Green
Other doctoral programs	—	—	—
California, Irvine	Political psychology (2) ^c	Program—major	S. Rosenberg
George Washington U.	Psychology of political behavior	Program—major ^c	J. Post
Rutgers	Political psychology	Individualized	R. Lau, D. Owen, R. Sigel, R. Wilson
South Carolina	Psychology and politics	Individualized	B. Glad, W. Kreml, J. Rosati
SUNY-Stony Brook	Political psychology	Program—major	S. Feldman, L. Huddy, M. Lodge, K. McGraw, V. Ottati, J. Scholz

^aUnless otherwise noted, courses and programs are listed in Political Science.^bSeparately listed in psychology and political science.^cJointly listed in political science and psychology.^dPsychology only.

Yale University

The Program in Political Psychology at Yale began in 1969, with graduate training support from the National Institute of Mental Health. For many years, it was housed primarily in the Political Science Department. After a delay when the grant ended, the program was enlarged and reorganized in 1989. It is presently located in the Institution for Social and Policy Studies and has a major focus on intergroup and interethnic conflict. Political psychology can be elected as an area of concentration in either psychology or political science. Participating faculty are Robert Abelson (psychology and political science), Assaad Azzi (psychology), Donald Green (political science), and Leonard Doob (psychology, emeritus). Courses are taught in political psychology, intergroup conflict and aggression, the psychology of political groups, public opinion and voting behavior, and structural modeling, and a weekly research seminar for faculty and graduate students. The contact person is Robert P. Abelson (Psychology Department).

UCLA

A seminar in political psychology, cross-listed between psychology and political science has been taught by Sears since 1970. The Program in Political Psychology began in 1989. It offers an official minor area in the doctoral programs in history, political science, and psychology, and a major area in history. A one-quarter introductory proseminar is team-taught by seven faculty members from those three departments plus sociology (Lawrence Bobo, Shanto Iyengar, Deborah Larson, Peter Loewenberg, Jim Sidanius, John Zaller, and David O. Sears). More advanced seminars are taught by these faculty in such areas as psychohistory, political communication, mass attitudes and behavior, and American foreign policy, as well as in political psychology in general. A biweekly two-quarter workshop series features speakers from UCLA and other universities. Sears (Psychology Department) is the director of the program (brochure available).

SUNY-Stony Brook

The Political Psychology Program at SUNY-Stony Brook began in the late 1970s and is housed in the Department of Political Science. It is one of the three major specialties in which a student may take a Ph.D. in political science. A first-year Foundations of Political Psychology and Behavior core course is required of all students in the department, and seven more advanced elective courses are offered in political psychology (including Political Cognition, Group Processes and Social Influence, American Political Ideology, and Political So-

cialization and Development). The program has emphasized experimental work, and has extensive laboratories for political psychological research. Faculty include Stanley Feldman, Milton Lodge, and John Scholz, with backgrounds in political science, and Leonie Huddy, Kathleen McGraw, and Victor Ottati, with backgrounds in social psychology. Scholz is the director of graduate studies (brochure available).

University of Wisconsin (Madison)

The Program in Political Psychology and Sociology began in 1982, and is housed in the Department of Political Science. A graduate course in political psychology is taught by Virginia Sapiro, in mass political behavior by Jack Dennis, and in political affect and cognition by Richard Merelman. Political psychology serves as a formal major or minor area for the Ph.D. in political science. Other central faculty are Murray Edelman, Diane Mutz, and Diane Rubenstein. The contact person is the chair of political science (Dennis Dresang; brochure available).

CUNY-Graduate Center

An interdisciplinary doctoral concentration in the psychology of political behavior began in 1988 (for a more detailed description, see Renshon, 1990). It is a formal subfield for students in any of the five major areas of political science, and also serves as a concentration in anthropology, psychology, or sociology. There is a core course in political science, *Psychodynamics of Political Behavior*, taught by Stanley Renshon, and advanced courses in political behavior, psychohistory, social and psychological theory, social/cognitive psychology and politics, and policy analysis. The key faculty are Renshon, Robert Lifton, Charles Strozier, Irwin Katz, Asher Arian, Paul Wachtel, and Edward Hollander. All told, 22 faculty are listed as supporting the program, with an additional seven as associated faculty from other universities in the immediate area. Renshon is the coordinator (Department of Political Science; brochure available).

UC Irvine

Political Psychology became one of two formal concentrations in the doctoral program in the Department of Politics and Society in 1989. The aim is to provide broad professional training in political science and psychology and to direct research which integrates the theoretical concerns of both disciplines. There are two courses in political psychology, a team-taught proseminar (with

David Easton, Harry Eckstein, Ross Quillian, Salvatore Maddi, and Shawn Rosenberg) and a course taught by Shawn Rosenberg. Students are required to take six other courses: Political Analysis (Easton and Eckstein), Micropolitics (Rosenberg), Macropolitics (Rein Taagepera), Cognitive Science (David LaBerge/Duncan Luce), Personality and Psychopathology (Maddi), Social Cognition (William Thompson) and Developmental Psychology (Ellen Greenberger). The contact person is Shawn Rosenberg, Department of Politics and Society (brochure available).

Ohio State University

A formal minor program in political psychology began in 1990. It involves two core courses in political psychology and four survey courses in more specialized areas of the field: in the Political Science Department, Introduction to Political Psychology (Margaret Hermann), Personality and Politics (Hermann), the Psychology of Mass Politics (Wendy Rahn and/or Jon Krosnick), and Foreign Policy Decisionmaking (Hermann or Richard Hermann); and in the Psychology Department, Psychology of Political Behavior (Krosnick), and the Psychology of International Relations (Dan Christie, Thomas Milburn). It draws as well on a series of other standing courses in political science and psychology. The program also runs a student-faculty discussion group six times annually, and a month-long Summer Institute in Political Psychology (which is open to students and junior faculty outside Ohio State). The core faculty also includes, in political science, Paul Beck, C. Sylvan, and Herbert Weisberg. The program coordinator is Margaret Hermann.

George Washington University

A field of concentration in political psychology is being developed, with the aid of an Office of Education grant, in the School of International Affairs and the departments of Psychology and Political Science. The intention is that it would become a specialty at the master's level and a subfield option at the doctoral level. The formal application is expected to be made during 1991–92. Presently a jointly listed graduate course in the psychology of political behavior is being offered in these three departments by Jerrold Post, who is the key contact person (School of International Affairs).

University of Michigan

Political psychology serves as a formal major or minor area for the political science Ph.D. The central course is an omnibus proseminar in political psycholo-

gy taught by Donald R. Kinder. Other relevant faculty include M. Kent Jennings in political science and David Winter in psychology, but there is at present no formal link between the departments or graduate-level work in psychology.

Individualized Specialties

Our informants also stated that political psychology can serve as a legitimate individualized specialty, rather than a formal concentration, in a number of doctoral programs: In political science, at North Carolina, Illinois, New Mexico, South Carolina, Indiana, Duke, Princeton, Northern Illinois, Texas Tech, Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Rutgers, and British Columbia (major or minor); and in psychology, at Maine (minor only).

CRITICAL MASS

The potential for extensive doctoral training in political psychology, and for expansion in doctoral training beyond existing programs, depends on the presence of a critical mass of relevant faculty at any given university.

One indicator of a university's critical mass in an area is the presence of more than one individual teaching the same course. This is common with introductory courses in major disciplinary subfields such as social psychology or American politics, especially in large universities. However, this is not yet very widespread, at least not at the graduate level. We asked who normally teaches these courses. The explicitly labeled political psychology courses are almost always associated with just one name. The exceptions are Ohio State, SUNY-Stony Brook, and UCLA, which list more than one instructor for the basic course.

Another index of critical mass is the number of faculty members cited either as teaching political psychology at the graduate level or as potential contact persons. At one extreme, five of the institutions identified earlier as having extensive training programs cited at least six faculty members each (Wisconsin-Madison, UCLA, SUNY-Stony Brook, CUNY Graduate Center, Ohio State). Two others with viable political psychology programs identified at least three faculty members each (UC Irvine, Yale). And seven others without current programs also identified at least three faculty each (South Carolina, Minnesota, UC Berkeley, Syracuse, Rutgers, North Carolina, Hawaii). These latter institutions should be the best bets for further development of graduate programs in political psychology. However, of the 57 institutions offering some graduate work in the field, the largest number identified only one "lone wolf" person carrying on political psychology (39%).

DISCUSSION

Let us summarize our main findings. First of all, the main topics of political psychology have been taught at the graduate level for quite a number of years under various separate titles. Most common have been courses on mass political behavior. During the 1960s and early 1970s, many, if not most, major political science departments developed such courses under the headings of political behavior, public opinion, voting behavior, mass media, or other such terms. These courses presented a "traditional" package of research on mass political behavior as that field developed in the 1960s. During the early 1970s, a few universities began to offer courses in other subfields of political psychology that were more explicitly psychological, such as political socialization, politics and personality, and the psychology of international conflict. In this period, however, course titles rarely used the term "political psychology" itself.

In the 1980s, after the establishment of ISPP and *Political Psychology*, an increasing number of graduate courses called "political psychology" emerged. These were most often, though not exclusively, taught in political science departments. It is noteworthy that some such course is now taught in most major doctorate-granting political science departments in the United States.⁴ Still, while political psychology has generally "gotten onto the map" at the graduate level, in that it is regularly taught at many universities, it has for the most part not yet achieved the status of a major subfield of its parent disciplines.

Mostly, graduate courses in "political psychology" cover a limited subset of the field. In only a few cases have truly omnibus courses been designed—most of them rather recently—that cover the full range of topics in the field. This is true regardless of whether the course is formally labeled "political psychology" or is an explicitly delimited subset of the field. One challenge, then, is to try to unite the very disparate elements that the field comprises. To toot our own horn a bit, that is what we have tried to do in our Proseminar in Political Psychology at UCLA. We have strong representation of the various elements of the mass political behavior tradition, in John Zaller (public opinion), Lawrence Bobo (racial attitudes), Shanto Iyengar (media), and David Sears (public opinion; political socialization). Mixed with them are those who teach personality types

⁴We received only a relative handful of responses from nations other than the United States. Two institutions (Nijmegen, in the Netherlands, and Complutense, in Spain) report teaching "political psychology" per se. Courses in prejudice (Nijmegen), leadership (Hebrew University), nationalism (Central University of Venezuela), persuasion and propaganda (Brussels-Free University, Copenhagen), messianism (Bar-Ilan), social psychology of conflict (London School of Economics), and peace (Hebrew University) were also reported. In terms of programs, the University of Melbourne offers a formal master's specialty in the Department of Political Science, and individualized Ph.D. programs in political psychology are possible at Berlin (Free University), Copenhagen, Hebrew University, Gakusim (Law), LSE, and Melbourne. However, we do not feel our sampling is adequate to permit this to stand as a real survey of graduate offerings outside North America.

(Jim Sidanius), psychobiography (Peter Loewenberg), and international conflict (Deborah Larson). It may be that covering the various “political psychologies” in one graduate course will usually depend on team-teaching, as long as few researchers are trained in political psychology as a major subfield in its own right. Hopefully, though, there will be a gradual expansion of the ranks of those who can “do it all” in this field, as the broader graduate programs now being developed take hold.

We have identified seven genuine doctoral training programs in political psychology. It is noteworthy that most of them are of very recent vintage indeed. They offer specialization to students whose degrees will be in political science or psychology. Most involve multiple members of the faculty with quite different specialties: two of them draw faculty from a wide range of disciplines (CUNY Graduate Center and UCLA); three others draw faculty from political science and psychology (Yale, Ohio State, and UC Irvine); two others (SUNY-Stony Brook and Wisconsin-Madison) are located solely within political science; and the remaining two (Michigan and George Washington University) rest heavily on one or two faculty members. To this point, no universities offer a Ph.D. in political psychology independent of the traditional disciplinary doctoral programs.

While political psychology is not a large or major specialty at the doctoral level, then, the trend is encouraging. There are growing opportunities to take doctoral training in political psychology. Graduate students at most major universities can be exposed to the field if they choose. And an encouraging number of genuine training programs are under way, most quite recent, with a critical mass of faculty and courses. Most of them are broadly interdisciplinary. The current generation of political psychologists is largely self-taught and usually idiosyncratically so. As a result, few can really cover the whole field at the graduate level, and political psychology at that level is rather fragmented (though less so at the undergraduate level; see Funk & Sears, 1991). It may be, then, that the next generation, with broader training across the full range of specialties, will develop creative theoretical and empirical advances not possible in the past.

REFERENCES

- Funk, C. L., and Sears, D. O. (1991). Are we reaching undergraduates? A survey of course offerings in political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 12, in press.
- Jones, L. V., Lindzey, G., and Coggshall, P. E. (Eds.). (1982). *An assessment of research-doctorate programs in the United States: Social and behavioral sciences*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Kinder, D. R., and Sears, D. O. (1985). Public opinion and political action. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*, 3rd ed. (Vol. 2, pp. 659–741). New York: Random House.

- Klingemann, H. D. (1986). Ranking the graduate departments in the 1980s: Toward objective qualitative indicators. *PS*, 19, 651–661.
- Klingemann, H. D., Grofman, B., and Campagna, J. (1989). The Political Science 400: Citations by Ph.D. cohort and by Ph.D. granting institution. *PS*, 22, 258–270.
- Knutson, J. N. (Ed.). (1973). *Handbook of political psychology*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lipset, S. M., Lazarsfeld, P. F., Barton, A. H., & Linz, J. (1954). The psychology of voting: An analysis of political behavior. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 1124–1175). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Renshon, S. (1990). The interdisciplinary concentration in the psychology of political behavior. *Political Psychology*, 11, 211–215.
- Sears, D. O. (1969). Political behavior. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* Rev. ed. (Vol. 5). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Sears, D. O. (1989). The ecological niche of political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 10, 501–506.